

they say they're going to do. And I believe now, after 10 days of hard work, we have got that done.

*Q.* [Inaudible]—Boutros Boutros-Ghali will that make it easier for you to coordinate Washington policy?

*The President.* Because he has delegated the authority? Absolutely. And I applaud that. That was the right decision for him to take, and it shows that he, too, is concerned that the United Nations cannot express a commitment to protect the security of people and then walk away from it. I applaud the statement that he made and the action he took today.

*Q.* Do you wish maybe he had said it a little sooner than just the exact time of the vote?

*The President.* Well, of course, but you know, the whole world can't calibrate their activities based on what we're doing here at a given moment. I think that the United Nations is working their way through this. And keep in mind, they've had people on the ground. They haven't wanted to have their hostages taken and then been made vulnerable to being killed or tortured

or imprisoned for long periods of time. But if the United Nations guarantees the security of certain areas and certain standards of conduct, then we have to stand behind the guarantees.

I think President Chirac and Prime Minister Major, in putting together this rapid reaction force, and then the work that I was able to do to get them to come back to a clear line of authority to use aggressive air—that is the strong approach. That is the approach that we know from experience has a chance to work, to raise the price of aggression.

The other course has a lot of downsides, and we don't know if it will work. We know this will work if we do it. And I am determined to see that we follow through.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to actor Tom Hanks; United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali; President Jacques Chirac of France; and Prime Minister John Major of the United Kingdom.

## Statement on Proposed Foreign Relations Legislation

July 26, 1995

Congress is now considering legislation—S. 908, “The Foreign Relations Revitalization Act of 1995”—that would undermine the President's authority to conduct our Nation's foreign policy and deny us the resources we need to lead in the world. If this legislation comes to my desk in its present form, I will veto it.

S. 908 attacks the President's constitutional authority to conduct America's foreign policy. No President, Democrat or Republican, could accept these restrictions because they threaten the President's ability to protect and promote American interests around the world.

The legislation would ban or severely restrict diplomatic relations with key countries. Indeed, had it been in effect a few months ago, it would have prevented us from concluding the agreement with North Korea to dismantle its nuclear program. The legislation would handcuff our ability to take part in and lead United Nations operations, limiting our choice each time a crisis arose to acting alone or not at all. The legislation

would abolish three important agencies, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency. Each is already making serious and successful efforts to streamline its operations, as part of my administration's re-inventing Government program. Eliminating them entirely would undermine our effectiveness, not enhance it.

In short, the legislation would put Congress in the business of micromanaging our Nation's foreign policy, a business it should not be in.

This legislation combined with S. 961, “The Foreign Aid Reduction Act of 1995,” would also slash our international affairs budget, which already is only a little over 1.3 percent of our total Federal budget. We use these funds to fight the spread of nuclear weapons and technology; to combat terrorists, drug traffickers, and international criminals; to create American jobs by opening new markets for our exports; and to support the forces of peace, democracy, and

*July 26 / Administration of William J. Clinton, 1995*

human rights around the world who look to America for leadership.

The proposed cuts in the international affairs budget are dangerous and shortsighted. We know from experience that it is a lot less costly, in terms of money spent and lives lost, to rely on development aid and diplomacy now than it is to send in our troops later. There is a price to be paid for American leadership. But the return on our investment, in terms of increased security and greater prosperity for the American people, more than makes up for the

cost. What America cannot afford are the foreign affairs budget cuts proposed in these bills.

As I have made clear before, I want to work with Congress to get an international affairs bill I can sign, a bill that protects the President's authority to conduct foreign policy, maintains vital resources, and reflects a bipartisan spirit that serves America's interests. The legislation Congress is considering fails each of those tests. If it is sent to me as it now stands, I will veto it.

## Statement on Senate Action on Appropriations Legislation

*July 26, 1995*

Yesterday's action by a Senate appropriations subcommittee removing funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy would seriously undermine the Nation's battle against drug abuse and drug-related crime.

Removal of all funding for this office would severely curtail my ability to sustain a coordinated strategy among some 50 Federal agencies involved in drug control, including supply and demand, enforcement, interdiction, eradication, education, treatment, and prevention. Just when this coordinated effort is showing sustained success, the subcommittee is proposing we go back to the days when the Nation did not have a coordinated drug control strategy.

The Republican majority is already proposing severe cuts in antidrug programs—a 60 percent cut in safe and drug-free schools, which teaches 39 million children about the dangers of drugs; a 26 percent cut in prevention and treatment services aimed at reducing the number of potential criminals; and a 50 percent cut in international antidrug cooperation programs, a cut

that could prevent the continued arrests of the world's top drug kingpins.

Members of Congress cannot tie our hands by cutting effective antidrug programs, kill the very office that coordinates our national antidrug strategy, and then expect to be taken seriously when they criticize the administration for not doing more. It's time instead for the Congress to support our antidrug initiatives.

Lee Brown, Director of the ONDCP, is doing an extraordinary job focusing the Nation's attention on the need to fight drugs at all levels. He has helped me develop a comprehensive, effective, balanced antidrug strategy and has worked to reduce duplication among those agencies who play a role in our counternarcotics efforts.

As this bill is now constructed, I will not sign it. I urge the full Appropriations Committee and the Senate to restore the funding of this office that is so critical to our battle against drugs.

## Remarks on Signing Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

*July 27, 1995*

Good morning. Before I sign this bill I'd like to thank the congressional leadership from both parties for sticking with this project through

thick and thin. Right before we came in, one of the Senators said this is the only bill he'd ever seen that was passed 16 different times.